

As set out in the Rule 132 Declaration, the benefit of using a direct drive on the stripper blade is to provide a strong even power for cutting. The benefits of using a hydraulic drive include, elimination of jerky starts and stops which effect the blades cutting ability, variable speed control which can be set to the most efficient removal rate of the stripper blade for the flooring being removed, automatic stopping of the motion of the stripping machine when the pressure in the hydraulic lines becomes too high due to the stripper hitting an obstacle, setting the speed of the hydraulic motor for the wheels independently of the speed of the electric motor driving the cutting blade, ease of putting the stripping machine into reverse to enhance maneuverability, using less electricity, fewer mechanical parts, less maintenance, and quieter operation. The combination of these features yields a superior floor-stripping machine, which has heretofore not been appreciated and is not obvious due to the complex interaction of the features listed.

The applicant therefore believes that Claims 1, 7 and 19 are allowable over Fisher in view of Anderson and that the dependent claims based on claims 1, 7 and 19 are also allowable.

The applicant has enjoyed phenomenal market success with the claimed Walk Behind Floor Stripping Machine with Hydraulic Drive. The features provided by the combination of the direct drive to power the cutting blade to remove flooring and the hydraulic drive on the wheels to propel the Floor Stripping Machine selectively in forward and reverse travel was heretofore not appreciated by those skilled in the art and was therefore not offered in Floor Stripping Machines despite the advantages.

The commercial success of the invention shows that the claimed features where not appreciated and it was not obvious for one skilled in the art to combine Fisher and Anderson to yield the claimed invention.

The new combination of the electric motor directly driving the stripper blade and the hydraulic drive on the wheels provides a machine that solves a long felt unsolved need for a self propelled floor stripping machine which is easy to handle and efficiently strips flooring.

The lack of implementation by others also shows that it was not obvious to provide the claimed invention.

The applicant therefore believes that Claims 1, 7 and 19 are allowable over Fisher in view of Anderson and that the dependent claims based on claims 1, 7 and 19 are also allowable.

Further the combination of Fisher and Anderson 899 would not yield the claimed invention because Fisher has a gas powered internal combustion engine for driving a hydraulic pump and then has two valve means for controlling two hydraulic motors one on a rotating brush and one on a pair of drive wheels. Anderson 809 has a moving blade driven directly by an electric motor. The combination of Anderson and Fisher does not yield the claimed direct electric motor drive of a blade and the electric motor also powering a hydraulic pump for driving a hydraulic motor on drive wheels.

Similarly the combination of Fisher and Anderson 566 does not yield the claimed invention because Anderson 566 has a direct drive of the electric motor on the stripper blade and the drive wheels.

Since the claimed features are lacking in the combinations and there is no suggestion in the art to combine the references in the manner the examiner proposes the claims are not obvious.

The applicant therefore believes that Claims 1, 7 and 19 are allowable over Fisher in view of Anderson and that the dependent claims based on claims 1, 7 and 19 are also allowable.

It is believed that the claims are all allowable over the examiners objections for the reasons stated.

Respectfully submitted,

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.



Steven E. Kahm
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 30860
900 Second Avenue South
Suite 820
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Phone: 612-339-7461

December 19, 2002